

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this Response, claims 1-4, 6-12, 17-54 stood pending in this application, with claims 1-3 and 17-22 being independent claims. With this Response Applicants cancel claims 1-54, and add new claims 55-73, with independent claims 55, 64, 66, 67, and 70-73. The amendments add no new matter, as the application as originally-filed supports each of the new claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

The Office action rejects each of claims 1-4, 6-12, and 17-23, 25-49, 53, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ashida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,003,532, hereinafter "Ashida") in view of either the knowledge of an ordinary skilled artisan or one or more of Motohashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030220123 A1, hereinafter "Motohashi") and Ito (JP 2003-102074, hereinafter "Ito"). Each of pending claims 55-65 recites a wireless microphone communication system comprising, in part, one or more controllers, each controller coupled to an input device and sending a character string input with the input device from the controller to the other controllers, and each of the controllers causing a corresponding display device to display character strings received from other controllers. Each of claims 66-69 recites a wireless microphone communication system comprising, in part, a video camera coupled to a controller, the controller, in response to an RF level obtained from a receiver, causing an image from the video camera to be displayed on a display device (claim 66) or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device (claims 67-69). Each of claims 70-73 generally requires at least one or more of the elements described above with respect to claims 55-69. For example, each of claims 70 and 71 recites that a controller, upon receiving a character string transmitted from another controller, causes the display device to display the character string, and each of claims 72 and 73 recites a video camera coupled to a controller, the controller causing (in claim 73 in response to a signal strength obtained from a receiver) an image from the video camera to be

displayed on a display device or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device.

The features of the pending claims and, in particular, the features of new claims 66-73, have a particular advantage over prior wireless microphone systems in that a performer on a stage (or any person viewing the display device) can determine where so-called “dead points” exist on the stage. In claim 72, for example, the controller causes the display to display both the wireless signal strength and at least one image transmitted by the camera. Thus, as a person (e.g., a performer) carrying a wireless microphone moves around the stage, the person can see how the wireless signal strength varies in relation to the person’s position on the stage. In claim 73, the controller causes the camera to capture and store an image if the received signal strength falls below a pre-determined level such that, at a later time, a person can review the areas of the stage where the signal strength is not nominal.

As described in the paragraphs below, none of Ashida, Motohashi, or Ito, individually or in any combination, can render obvious any of the pending claims because each of Ashida, Motohashi, and Ito, individually or in any combination, fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited by the claims and, in particular, none discloses or suggests: (1) one or more controllers, each ***controller coupled to an input device and sending a character string*** input with the input device ***from the controller to the other controllers***, and ***each of the controllers causing a corresponding display device to display character strings received from other controllers***; (2) a video camera ***positioned above a stage*** and coupled to a controller, the ***controller causing an image from the video camera to be displayed on a display device or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device***; or (3) a video camera ***positioned above a stage*** and coupled to a controller, the controller, ***in response to a signal strength (or RF level) obtained from a receiver***, causing an image from the video camera to be displayed on a display device or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device.

Ashida

Ashida is directed to a multi-point video conferencing system with a plurality of stations, each station having one or more cameras, a microphone, a speaker, one or more displays, and a console, all of which are connected to a conference control unit. The conference control unit controls the input/output of input data from the cameras and output data to the displays, and also controls the coding/decoding of image data and audio data and the multiplexing/demultiplexing of image and audio data. See Ashida at column 1, lines 10-35. The system disclosed in Ashida merely sends **audio and video data** from one camera and microphone to one or more displays and speakers. Ashida does not, by itself or in combination with either of Motohashi or Ito, disclose or suggest a controller receiving a **character string** from a corresponding **input device** and **sending the character string to other controllers**. As described above, Ashida discloses communicating **audio and video data** between control units. However, receiving audio and video data is not the same as **receiving a character string from an input device and sending the character string to other controllers**.

Moreover, Ashida does not by itself or in combination with either of Motohashi or Ito, disclose or suggest **a video camera positioned above a stage**, much less a video camera coupled to a controller, the controller, **in response to a signal strength (or RF level) obtained from a receiver**, causing an image from the video camera to be displayed on a display device or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device, as required by at least some of the pending claims. For at least these reasons, Ashida does not and cannot, alone or in combination with either or both of Motohashi or Ito, disclose or suggest the limitations now recited by the pending claims, and Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Motohashi

Like Ashida, Motohashi fails to disclose or suggest, by itself or in combination with either or both of Ashida or Ito, a controller receiving a **character string** from a corresponding **input device** and **sending the character string to other controllers**

which controllers **cause a corresponding display device to display the received character strings**. The Examiner alleges that paragraph 0040 of Motohashi discloses display on a display device of character strings received from an input device. (See Office Action at page 4.) However, this allegation is incorrect and, in any event, does not address the limitations of the instant claims. Paragraph 0040 of Motohashi discloses merely that "...a display portion...displays a moving picture, a still picture and a character string." Paragraph 0040 does not disclose or suggest that the displayed character string is **input by an input device** as alleged by the Examiner (*i.e.*, the character string could be received from a telephone network by the mobile telephone on which the display device is disposed), and does not disclose or suggest that **the displayed character string is received at one controller from another controller into which the character string was input by an input device**, as generally recited by at least some of the claims.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the mere mention in Motohashi of a display device (on a mobile telephone) capable of displaying a character string with any disclosure in Ashida and/or Ito, and doing so would not result in the limitations of the pending claims, which generally require that **a controller to cause a corresponding display device to display a character string received from another controller into which the character string was entered by an input device**.

Further, Motohashi does not by itself or in combination with either of Ashida or Ito, disclose or suggest **a video camera positioned above a stage**, much less a video camera coupled to a controller, the controller, **in response to a signal strength (or RF level) obtained from a receiver**, causing an image from the video camera to be displayed on a display device or displayed on a display device and stored on a storage device, as required by at least some of the pending claims. For at least these reasons, Motohashi does not and cannot, alone or in combination with either or both of Ashida or Ito, disclose or suggest the limitations now recited by the pending claims.

Examiner's Official Notice

As described above, Applicants believe that each of the claims is presently in allowable form *regardless* of any facts “officially noticed.” Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully traverse the “official notice” taken by the Examiner throughout the Office action, particularly where such “official notice” is ***unsupported by citation to some reference work recognized as standard in the pertinent art***. Applicants point out that, where official notice is taken of a fact, unsupported by documentary evidence, the MPEP requires that the technical line of reasoning underlying such notice must be ***clear and unmistakable***. See MPEP § 2144.03.


In the pending Office action, the Examiner takes official notice that *both* the concepts *and* advantages of “providing a wireless microphone and a LAN network are well known in the art” but provides neither documentary evidence *nor* a technical line of reasoning for taking official notice of either of these alleged facts. See Office action at page 5. Applicants respectfully submit (1) that it is not “well known in the art,” much less ***clearly and unmistakably*** known in the art, to provide a wireless microphone; and (2) that there does not exist ***clear and unmistakable*** motivation to modify the system disclosed in Ashida to include a wireless microphone. To the contrary, Applicants perceive no benefit from modifying the system disclosed in Ashida to use a wireless microphone, because the remainder of the components used in the system disclosed in Ashida would continue to require wires, thus negating any benefit related to portability, efficiency, or cost. Therefore, ***Applicants request that the Examiner provide documentary evidence for each of these officially noticed facts if these rejections are maintained***. See MPEP § 2144.03.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, all remaining claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. Applicants submit this Response with a Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time, a Request for Continued Examination, and the required fees, thereby extending the time for Response to March 30, 2009. Although Applicants believe that no additional fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 19036/41594. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 26, 2009

By:   
Jeremy D. Protas  
Registration No.: 61,681  
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300  
Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300  
Attorney for Applicants